Virginia Social Services System
Strategic Plan – Goal 3 Steering Committee Meeting
Thursday, April 21, 2005
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Powhatan Room
VCU-VISSTA Center

"Improve business productivity through effective automation"

Attendees: Mr. Ray Goodwin, Mr. Gordon Ragland, Mr. Dana Paige, Mr. Morris Campbell, Mr. Joe Crane (Mr. Nick Young), Mr. Harry Sutton, Mr. Duke Storen, Mr. Ron King, Mr. Tom Little, Mr. David Mitchell, Mr. David Mix, Ms. Kelly Calder, Ms. Debbie Secor, Ms. Libby Mounts, Mr. Buzz Cox, Ms. Andrea Hendricks, Ms. Della Pearson, Ms. Barbra Caris, Ms. Vicky Collins, Mr. Larry Mason

Ray Goodwin reported that Gordon Ragland, Dottie Wells, Buzz Cox and he had spent the last week in the field talking with locals about the BPR objectives. It was a good week. Attendance was low at the beginning of the week, but increased as the week progressed. There were a lot of questions and discussion. They heard a lot about CSA. They have an appointment to meet with Kim McGaughey, the Director of CSA on Friday, April 29th.

A meeting is being scheduled to meet with Vickie Johnson-Scott and Terry Watt in DC about SACWIS requirements to ensure the BPR process is not building expectations about conceptual changes.

Tom Little, Assistant Director of Quality Management was introduced. He will be replacing Jack Frazier on the Goal 3 Steering Committee. Jack is currently serving as co-chair of another steering committee.

Gordon reiterated that the local meetings had gone well. The feedback from the LWA's is that the Steering Committee is heading in the right direction. Dottie stated Gordon did a nice job with the presentation.

The BPR is proceeding on schedule. The "as is" model should be completed by June.

The four PPEA proposals are currently being reviewed for proprietary issues. The characteristics section of each proposal needs to include enough information so that when it is posted it can be understood. The intent is to publish the proposals around May 1. The Committee will have no further contact with any of the vendors during the 60 day posting period. Up until that time, it is acceptable for the members of the Committee to meet with any of the vendors who initiate a meeting. Non-disclosure agreements will need to be signed by the members of this Committee before proprietary copies of the proposals are distributed.

The main purpose of this meeting is to define the objectives for the review committees –
what values should be focused on.

Benefits to Customers

A discussion relating to the use of the term "customers", both internal and external,
ensued.

> **Action Item**: Prepare a glossary of terms so that terminology will be uniform throughout
> the process. Barbra Caris and Della Pearson will work on this item. Debbie Secor stated
> that VITA has a glossary. She will make it available to Barbra and Della as a resource.

A list of benefits to our "customers" to be included in the proposal:
- change the focus to reflect end users
- data/integration/data exchange
- differing capacities for local governing IT – one size does not fit all
- open Web-enabling systems
- develop a foundation from which to build/add other systems, not just another stand
  alone system
- compatible with wireless technologies
- electronic case files, IVR capabilities (meet VITA standards)

It was decided that the review committees will use the published Attributes for VDSS
PPEA Proposals and include the issues brought forth today in their review process.

Issues with the Unisys box cost savings need to be clarified before any proposal is
accepted.

A diagram outlining the review process was distributed. Volunteers are being solicited to
serve on the committees. There will be a Business Review Subcommittee comprised of
LDSS, VDSS and DMAS members. There will also be a Technical Review
Subcommittee comprised of LDSS, VDSS and VITA members. Supporting services will
be provided by a PPEA Assistance Contractor Team, an IT Customer Satisfaction Survey
Team, and a PPEA Legal Assistance team.

 The timeframe for the two main subcommittees, the Business Review and the Technical
Review, is approximately one month of intensive work. Based on the timeframe it took
VITA to review the proposals, the subcommittees can count on 30 days to independently
review the material. Then, meetings will be held to review the material by the whole
subcommittee. Ray would like the subcommittees in place and ready to begin work by
the end of the first week of May. The months of July through September will then be
spent reviewing the material in light of the BPR "to be" model and LWA comments from
the posted proposals. A report will be presented at the October Goal 3 Steering
Committee meeting.

Co-chairs for the subcommittees need to be one representative from a local agency and one representative from the State agency. Representatives from DMAS need to be involved in the process also.

If anyone would like to volunteer to be on either of these committees, they need to contact Ray or Gordon by Monday, April 25. There will be at least eight people on each subcommittee. The subcommittees may talk with others; the BPR team would be a good resource. First Data Government may also be involved in the review process. In order to keep the reference checks consistent, it was suggested that one person complete them for all the vendors. Larry Mason may be asked to do this for the Committee.

 It was also proposed that the same subcommittees perform the detailed review. That will be considered later. The statement was made that if the review process could be expanded to three months instead of one, volunteers to serve on the subcommittees might be easier to solicit. There is a data grid already developed that can be expanded for use in the review process. Support staff to track information relating to the review process will also be needed.

Ray reported that one strategy outlined in the Goal was a customer satisfaction survey. Garter, Inc. already has a survey that can be tailored to meet this need. Ray and Gordon will meet with Gartner and report back to this committee.